

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.    |  |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 10/805,131  | 03/19/2004      | Bjoern Magnussen     | ELLIP-007USB        | 3151                |  |  |
| 7663  | 7590 09/19/2006 | 09/19/2006           |                     | EXAMINER            |  |  |
| STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER                   |                 |                      | DOUGHERTY           | DOUGHERTY, THOMAS M |  |  |
| 75 ENTERPRISE, SUITE 250<br>ALISO VIEJO, CA 92656 |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER        |  |  |
|   | •               |                      | 2834                |                     |  |  |

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. |                     | Applicant(s)     |  |  |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|--|--|
|                 | 10/805,131          | MAGNUSSEN ET AL. |  |  |
|                 | Examiner            | Art Unit         |  |  |
|                 | Thomas M. Dougherty | 2834             |  |  |

|   | nomas м. Dougnerty   | 2034  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the  | correspondence add                                      | ress                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>9/5/06</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br>this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow<br>places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No<br>a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance<br>time periods:  | ving replies: (1) an amendment, af<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in  | fidavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C        | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)          |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date  | of the final rejection.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A<br>no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la<br>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (   | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin  | g date of the final rejecti                             | on.                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70  | 06.07(f).  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropr<br>inally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp  | liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be   | filed within two month                                  | ns of the date of                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of th                                   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,   | out prior to the date of filing a brief  | will not be entered b                                   | ecause                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  |  | ,   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or  | ter form for appeal by materially re   | educing or simplifying                                  | the issues for                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a  | corresponding number of finally rej  | ected claims.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13  | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co  | ompliant Amendment                                      | (PTOL-324).                             |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)  | :  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | lowable if submitted in a separate,  | timely filed amendme                                    | ent canceling the                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:   |  | ill be entered and an e                                 | explanation of                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary   | vercome all rejections under appe  | al and/or appellant fa                                  | ils to provide a                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | n of the status of the claims after e  | entry is below or attacl                                | ned.                                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>   | t does NOT place the application i   | n condition for allowa                                  | nce because:                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  |   | Λ                                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13.   | Phoma  | OM DOUGHERTY<br>IMARY EXAMINER                          | lette                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | PR   | MARY EXAMINER   |   |  |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: a close look at the applicants' figure 84 and figure 2 of Maeno et al. show similar rotations of driven components. Note component 402 of figure 2 of Maeno et al., it is driven by a drive element, 202 and these elements have similar constructions to the applicants 3 and 4 components, therefore, the Remarks are not persuasive.